

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

-----X  
COLONEL A. ADAMS,

Plaintiff,

— against —

**MEMORANDUM and ORDER**

05 CV 5211 (SLT)(LB)

WARNER BROTHERS PICTURES  
NETWORK, CASTLE ROCK  
ENTERTAINMENT and DISCOVERY  
OR SCIENCE CHANNEL NETWORK,

Defendants.

-----X  
**TOWNES, United States District Judge:**

In a Memorandum and Order dated June 29, 2007, this Court dismissed *pro se* plaintiff Colonel A. Adam's copyright infringement claim. By motion dated July 5, 2007, plaintiff now requests that this Court reconsider its dismissal of his copyright claim because he claims there was a "clerical error in the file concerning the Copyright drawing." He also states there was a book that Warner Bros. "didn't include in the Discovery Files that they didn't want [us] to see because it will show [us] the truth about why [he] said they copyright infringed my design art ATST & TSSS."

"The standard for granting . . . a motion [for reconsideration] is strict, and reconsideration will generally be denied unless the moving party can point to controlling decisions or data that the court overlooked – matters, in other words, that might reasonably be expected to alter the conclusion reached by the court." *Shrader v. CSX Transp., Inc.*, 70 F.3d 255, 257 (2d Cir. 1995) (citing cases). While this Court recognizes that *pro se* submissions must be held "to less stringent standards than formal pleadings drafted by lawyers," *Haines v. Kerner*, 404 U.S. 519, 520 (1972) (per curiam), *pro se* litigants are not "exempt . . . from compliance with relevant rules of procedural and substantive law." *Traguth v. Zuck*, 710 F.2d 90, 95 (2d Cir. 1983).

Plaintiff's July 5, 2007 motion does not state a basis for reconsideration. It does not suggest that there is any relevant point of law or fact which this Court might have overlooked. Accordingly, his motion for reconsideration is denied.

### **CONCLUSION**

Plaintiff's request for reconsideration of this Court's June 29, 2007, Memorandum and Order dismissing his copyright claim is hereby denied.

SO ORDERED.

*Sandra L. Townes*

SANDRA L. TOWNES  
United States District Judge

Dated: Brooklyn, New York  
July 11, 2007